arXiv:1608.00171v1 [math.AC] 30 Jul 2016

INTEGER-VALUED POLYNOMIALS ON COMMUTATIVE RINGS AND MODULES

JESSE ELLIOTT

Abstract. The ring of integer-valued polynomials on an arbitrary integral domain is well-studied. In this paper we initiate and provide motivation for the study of integer-valued polynomials on commutative rings and modules. Several examples are computed, including the integer-valued polynomials over the ring $R[T_1,\dots,T_n]/(T_1(T_1-r_1),\dots,T_n(T_n-r_n))$ for any commutative ring R and any elements $r_1,\dots,r_n$ of R, as well as the integer-valued polynomials over the Nagata idealization $R(+)M$ of M over R, where M is an R-module such that every non-zerodivisor on M is a non-zerodivisor of R.

1. Introduction

The ring of integer-valued polynomials on an integral domain is well-studied [2] [9]. In this paper we initiate and provide motivation for the study of integer-valued polynomials on commutative rings and modules.

All rings in this paper are assumed commutative with identity. Let R be a ring. The *total quotient ring* $T(R)$ of R is the localization $U^{-1}R$ of the ring R at the multiplicative set $U = R^{\mathrm{reg}}$ of all non-zerodivisors of R. We define

$$\mathrm{Int}(R) = \{f \in T(R)[X] : f(R) \subseteq R\},$$

which is a subring of $T(R)[X]$ containing $R[X]$. We call the ring $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ the ring of *integer-valued polynomials on* R. The most well-studied case is where $R = \mathbb{Z}$: the ring $\mathrm{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ is called the ring of *integer-valued polynomials* and is known to be a non-Noetherian Prüfer domain of Krull dimension two possessing a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module basis consisting of the binomial coefficient polynomials $1, X, \binom{X}{2}, \binom{X}{3}, \dots$. Its prime spectrum and Picard group, for example, are also known [2]. In the late 1910s, Pólya and Ostrowski initiated the study of further rings of integer-valued polynomials, namely, $\mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ for the ring $\mathcal{O}_K$ of integers in a number field K. There is an extensive literature on integer-valued polyomials rings over integral domains, including the two texts [2] and [9] witten in the 1990s.

Roughly a decade ago, the author proved a few elementary universal properties of $\mathrm{Int}(D)$ for any integral domain D [6]. More recently the author proved some less elementary universal properties of $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ for specific classes of rings R [4]. Consider the following conditions on a ring R.

(1) $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ is free as an R-module.
(2) $\mathrm{Int}(R)_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is free as an $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$-module and equals $\mathrm{Int}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})$ for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R.
(3) $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ has a unique structure of an *R-plethory* [1] with unit given by the inclusion $R[X] \longrightarrow \mathrm{Int}(R)$.
(4) $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ is the largest R-plethory contained in $T(R)[X]$.
(5) $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ left-represents a right adjoint for the inclusion from C to the category R-Alg of R-algebras for a unique full, bicomplete, and bireflective subcategory C of R-Alg (and an R-algebra A is in C if and only if for all $a \in A$ there is a unique R-algebra homomorphism $\mathrm{Int}(R) \longrightarrow A$ sending X to a).

Date: August 2, 2016.

In general, conditions (3)–(5) are equivalent, and they hold if either (1) or (2) holds [4, Theorems 2.9 and 7.11]. Moreover, conditions (4) and (5), when they hold, each provide a universal property for the ring $\mathrm{Int}(R)$. It is known, for example, that conditions (1) and (2) hold if R is a Dedekind domain or a UFD, and condition (2) holds if R is a Krull domain or more generally a domain of Krull type [4, Theorem 7.11]. Thus, the ring $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ can be characterized by the universal properties (4) and (5) for any ring R satisfying any of the conditions (1)–(3), which includes, for example, any domain R of Krull type.

The author has conjectured that there exist integral domains D such that $\mathrm{Int}(D)$ is not free as a D-module, or more generally such that the equivalent conditions (3)–(5) do not hold for $R = D$ [4, 5]. For the two universal properties (4) and (5) of $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ to hold one need not require that R be a domain, since if $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ are rings satisfying condition (4) (or (5)) then by [4, Corollary 7.15] the direct product $\prod_{i=1}^n R_i$ also satisfies conditions (4) and (5), and one has $\mathrm{Int}\left(\prod_{i=1}^n R_i\right) \cong \prod_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Int}(R_i)$. The fact that these universal properties of $\mathrm{Int}(R)$ can be easily shown to hold for some rings R with zerodivisors but not for others provides motivation for the study of integer-valued polynomials over such rings.

Beyond the direct products mentioned above, our first attempt (with students Ryan Hoffman, Cybill Kreil, and Alexander McBroom) was to compute the ring $\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon])$ of integer-valued polynomials on the ring $R[\varepsilon] = R[T]/(T^2)$ of dual numbers over R, where ε is the image of T in $R[T]/(T^2)$. In Section 2 we compute more generally the ring of integer-valued polynomials over the ring

$$R[\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n] = R[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(T_1^2, \ldots, T_n^2)$$

of *n-hyper-dual numbers over R*, where ε_i for all i is the image of T_i in the given quotient ring. A special feature of this example is that it provides an independent motivation for the study of integer-valued derivatives, as studied, for example, in [2, Chapter IX]. Another feature is that it implies that conditions (1)–(5) do not hold for $R = \mathbb{Z}[\varepsilon]$.

Let A a subset of $T(R)$. We define

$$\mathrm{Int}(A, R) = \mathrm{Int}^{(0)}(A, R) = \{f \in T(R)[X] : f(A) \subseteq R\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(A, R) = \{f \in \mathrm{Int}(A, R) : f' \in \mathrm{Int}(A, R)\},$$

where f' denotes the (formal) derivative of f. The former is a subring of $T(R)[X]$ called the ring of *integer-valued polynomials on A over R*, and the latter is the subring of $\mathrm{Int}(A, R)$ consisting of all integer-valued polynomials f on A over R whose derivative f' is also integer-valued on A. More generally, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Int}^{(n)}(A, R) &= \{f \in T(R)[X] : f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(n)} \in \mathrm{Int}(A, R)\} \\ &= \{f \in \mathrm{Int}(A, R) : f' \in \mathrm{Int}^{(n-1)}(A, R)\}\end{aligned}$$

for all positive integers n, and also

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(\infty)}(A, R) = \{f \in T(R)[X] : f, f', f'', \ldots \in \mathrm{Int}(A, R)\} = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Int}^{(n)}(A, R).$$

We write $\mathrm{Int}^{(n)}(R)$ for $\mathrm{Int}^{(n)}(R, R)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. The rings $\mathrm{Int}^{(n)}(R)$ are well-studied in the case where R is a domain [2, Chapter IX].

As an R-module, the ring $R[\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n]$ is free of rank 2^n, with a basis consisting of the elements $\varepsilon_S = \prod_{i \in S} \varepsilon_i$ for all subsets S of the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$; thus, as R-modules, one has

$$R[\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n] = \bigoplus_{S \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} R\varepsilon_S.$$

The following theorem is proved in Section 2.

Theorem 1.1 (with Ryan Hoffman, Cybill Kreil, and Alexander McBroom)**.** *Let R be a ring, let n be a positive integer, and let k be a nonnegative integer. One has*

$$\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n)^i \operatorname{Int}^{(n+k-i)}(R)[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n].$$

Equivalently, as R-modules, one has

$$\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]) = \bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \operatorname{Int}^{(n+k-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S.$$

Corollary 1.2. *Let R be a ring. Then $\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R,R[\varepsilon]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R)[\varepsilon]$ and $\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R[\varepsilon]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(k+1)}(R) + \operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R)\varepsilon$ for all nonnegative integers k. Moreover, one has $\operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R,R[\varepsilon]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R[\varepsilon]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R)[\varepsilon]$.*

Corollary 1.3. *Let R be a ring and n a positive integer. One has*

$$\operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R,R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R)[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n].$$

Theorem 1.1 provides an explicit realization of the rings $\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R)$ for $k \leq n$ in terms of the ring $\operatorname{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n])$. This provides motivation for the study of integer-valued polynomials on rings with zerodivisors, or alternatively for the study of the rings $\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R)$, either from the standpoint of the other. Moreover, by [4, Theorem 2.4 and Proposition 7.28], the second corollary above implies that if $\operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R)$ has the structure of an R-plethory—which holds if R is a Krull domain, by [4, Theorem 7.20]—then $\operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n])$ has the structure of an $R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]$-plethory. In particular, $\operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(\mathbb{Z}[\varepsilon]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(\infty)}(\mathbb{Z})[\varepsilon]$ has the structure of a $\mathbb{Z}[\varepsilon]$-plethory even though $\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}[\varepsilon])$ does not.

Let R be a ring, let $r_1,\dots,r_n \in R$, and let

$$R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_n] = R[T_1,\dots,T_n]/(T_1(T_1-r_1),\dots,T_n(T_n-r_n)),$$

where ρ_i is the image of T_i in the given quotient ring for all i. Note that

$$R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_n] = R[\rho_1][\rho_2]\cdots[\rho_n] = R[\rho_1]\otimes_R\cdots\otimes_R R[\rho_n].$$

Let $r = r_i$ and $\rho = \rho_i$ for a fixed i. The map $Q : R^2 \longrightarrow R$ given by $(x,y) \longmapsto x^2 + rxy$ is a rank two quadratic form over R, and the ring $R[\rho]$ is the even Clifford algebra of Q. If r is a unit, then $R[\rho] \cong R \times R$. If $r = 0$, then $R[\rho] = R[T]/(T^2)$ is the ring of dual numbers over R. If $r = 2$, then $R[\rho] = R[j] = R[U]/(U^2-1)$, where $j = \rho - 1$ and $j^2 = 1$, is the ring of *split complex numbers over* R. Our main result, Theorem 3.8 of Section 3, generalizes Theorem 1.1 by computing $\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_n])$.

In Section 4, we generalize Corollary 1.2 by computing $\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R(+)M)$ for any R-module M satisfying a certain regularity condition, where $R(+)M$ denotes the (Nagata) idealization of M over R. (Note that $R[\varepsilon] \cong R(+)R$.) This provides motivation for a generalization of integer-valued polynomials to modules. The final section, Section 5, connects such a generalization to the notion of polynomial torsion in modules.

2. Hyper-dual-integer-valued polynomials

Let R be a ring. The ring $R[\varepsilon] = R[T]/(T^2)$, where ε denotes the image of T in the given quotient ring, is called the *ring of dual numbers over* R. Its elements are expressions of the form $x + y\varepsilon$ with $x, y \in R$, where $\varepsilon^2 = 0$. The ring R is a subring of $R[\varepsilon]$ under the identification $x = x + 0\varepsilon$ for all $x \in R$. For all $z = x + y\varepsilon \in R[\varepsilon]$, one defines the *conjugate* of z to be $\overline{z} = x - y\varepsilon$ and the *modulus* of z to be $|z| = x$. Then one has $z\overline{z} = |z|^2$, as well as $|zw| = |z||w|$ and $\overline{zw} = \overline{z}\,\overline{w}$, for all $z, w \in R[\varepsilon]$, in analogy with the complex numbers.

Let n a positive integer. Recall from the introduction that we let

$$R[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n] = R[T_1, \dots, T_n]/(T_1^2, \dots, T_n^2),$$

where ε_i for all i is the image of T_i in the given quotient ring. Note that $R[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n] = R[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1}][\varepsilon]$, where $\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon$.

In this section we provide two proofs of Theorem 1.1, which computes $\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n])$ for all positive integers n and all nonnegative integers k. Our first proof is by induction on n. We first prove the base case $n = 1$ by computing $\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon])$. To this end we provide the following three elementary lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a ring and $z \in R[\varepsilon]$. Then z is a non-zerodivisor (resp., unit) of $R[\varepsilon]$ if and only if $|z|$ is a non-zerodivisor (resp., unit) of R.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be a ring. Then the total quotient ring $T(R[\varepsilon])$ of $R[\varepsilon]$ is given by $T(R)[\varepsilon]$, where $T(R)$ is the total quotient ring of R.*

Proof. If $z = x + y\varepsilon$ is a non-zerodivisor of $R[\varepsilon]$, then x is a non-zerodivisor of R, whence x is a unit of $T(R)$ and therefore $z = x + y\varepsilon$ is a unit of $T(R)[\varepsilon]$. Therefore every non-zerodivisor of $R[\varepsilon]$ is a unit of $T(R)[\varepsilon]$. Thus $T(R[\varepsilon])$ is a subring of $T(R)[\varepsilon]$. Let $w \in T(R)[\varepsilon]$, so $w = xu^{-1} + yv^{-1}\varepsilon$, where $x, y, u, v \in R$ and u and v are non-zerodivisors of R. Then $w = (vx + uy\varepsilon)(uv)^{-1}$, where $vx + uy \in R[\varepsilon]$, and where uv is a non-zerodivisor of R, hence a non-zerodivisor of $R[\varepsilon]$. Therefore $w \in T(R[\varepsilon])$. The lemma follows. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let R be a ring. Every $F \in R[\varepsilon][X]$ can be written uniquely in the form $F = f + g\varepsilon$, where $f, g \in R[X]$. Moreover, one has*

$$F(x + y\varepsilon) = f(x) + (f'(x)y + g(x))\varepsilon$$

for all $x, y \in R$.

Proof. We may write $F = \sum_{k=0}^{n}(f_k + g_k\varepsilon)X^k = f + g\varepsilon$, where $f = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f_k X^k \in R[X]$ and $g = \sum_{k=0}^{n} g_k X^k \in R[X]$, and clearly f and g are unique. Let k be a positive integer. By the binomial theorem one has $(x + y\varepsilon)^k = x^k + kx^{k-1}y\varepsilon$. In other words, if $h = X^k$, then one has $h(x + y\varepsilon) = h(x) + h'(x)y\varepsilon$. Therefore, extending this by linearity we see that $f(a + b\varepsilon) = f(a) + f'(a)b\varepsilon$ and $g(x + y\varepsilon) = g(x) + g'(x)y\varepsilon$. Therefore we have $F(x + y\varepsilon) = f(x + y\varepsilon) + (g(x + y\varepsilon))\varepsilon = f(x) + (f'(x)y + g(x))\varepsilon$, as claimed. □

Proposition 2.4 (with Ryan Hoffman, Cybill Kreil, and Alexander McBroom)**.** *One has*

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon]) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R) + \mathrm{Int}(R)\varepsilon$$

for any ring R.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, the total quotient ring of $R[\varepsilon]$ is $K[\varepsilon]$, where K is the total quotient ring of R. Let $F \in K[\varepsilon][X]$. By Lemma 2.3, we may write $F = f + g\varepsilon$ with $f, g \in K[X]$, and one has $F(x + y\varepsilon) = f(x) + (f'(x)y + g(x))\varepsilon$ for all $x, y \in K$. Therefore, F lies in $\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon])$ if and only if both $f(x)$ and $f'(x)y + g(x)$ lie in R for all $x, y \in R$, if and only if $f(x)$, $f'(x)$, and $g(x)$ lie in R for all $x \in R$, if and only if $f \in \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R)$ and $g \in \mathrm{Int}(R)$. Thus, $F \in K[\varepsilon][X] = T(R[\varepsilon])[X]$ lies in $\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon])$ if and only if F is of the form $f + g\varepsilon$ with $f \in \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R)$ and $g \in \mathrm{Int}(R)$. The proposition follows. □

As an R-module, the ring $R[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n]$ is free of rank 2^n, with a basis consisting of the elements $\varepsilon_S = \prod_{i \in S} \varepsilon_i$ for all subsets S of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The statement for arbitrary k follows readily from the statement for $k = 0$, so it suffices to prove the statement for $k = 0$. The proof is by induction on n. The statement for $n = 1$ is Proposition 2.4. Suppose the statement holds for $n-1$ for some $n > 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]) &= \operatorname{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_{n-1}][\varepsilon_n]) \\
&= \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_{n-1}]) + \operatorname{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_{n-1}])\varepsilon_n \\
&= \bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n-1\}} \operatorname{Int}^{(n-1+1-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S + \left(\bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n-1\}} \operatorname{Int}^{(n-1-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S\right)\varepsilon_n \\
&= \bigoplus_{n\notin S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \operatorname{Int}^{(n-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S + \bigoplus_{n\in S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \operatorname{Int}^{(n-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S \\
&= \bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \operatorname{Int}^{(n-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

We now provide a more direct proof of a stronger version of Theorem 1.1 that avoids induction on n.

Lemma 2.5. *Let R be a ring and n a positive integer. Then the total quotient ring $T(R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n])$ of $R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]$ is given by $T(R)[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n]$.*

Lemma 2.6 (with Ryan Hoffman, Cybill Kreil, and Alexander McBroom)**.** *Let R be a ring and n a positive integer. One has*

$$R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n][X] = R[X][\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n],$$

so every $F \in R[\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_n][X]$ can be written uniquely in the form $F = \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} f_S\varepsilon_S$, where $f_S \in R[X]$ for all $S \subseteq \{1,2,\dots,n\}$. Moreover, one has

$$F(x + x_1\varepsilon_1 + x_2\varepsilon_2 + \cdots + x_n\varepsilon_n) = \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} F^{(|S|)}(x)\prod_{i\in S} x_i\varepsilon_i \tag{2.1}$$

$$= \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \left(\sum_{T\subseteq S} f_{S-T}^{(|T|)}(x)\prod_{i\in T} x_i\right)\varepsilon_S \tag{2.2}$$

for all $x, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in R$. More generally, for all $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} x_S\varepsilon_S$, one has

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \left(\sum_{\substack{\text{partition}\\ S_1,\dots,S_k \text{ of } S}} F^{(k)}(x_\emptyset)\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{S_i}\right)\varepsilon_S \tag{2.3}$$

$$= \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \left(\sum_{T\subseteq S}\sum_{\substack{\text{partition}\\ T_1,\dots,T_k \text{ of } T}} f_{S-T}^{(k)}(x_\emptyset)\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{T_i}\right)\varepsilon_S. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Let $x = x_\emptyset$, so $\mathbf{x} - x = \sum_{T\neq\emptyset} x_T\varepsilon_T$. We may assume without loss of generality that R is a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$ and is therefore $\mathbb{Z}$-torsion-free. Then, by Taylor's theorem and the

multinomial theorem, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x)\frac{1}{k!}(\mathbf{x}-x)^k \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x)\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\sum_{T\neq\emptyset} k_T=k} \frac{k!}{\prod_{T\neq\emptyset} k_T!}\prod_{T\neq\emptyset}(x_T\varepsilon_T)^{k_T} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x)\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\substack{\sum_{T\neq\emptyset} k_T=k \\ \forall T\, k_T\in\{0,1\}}} k!\prod_{T\neq\emptyset}(x_T\varepsilon_T)^{k_T} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x)\sum_{\substack{\sum_{T\neq\emptyset} k_T=k \\ \forall T\, k_T\in\{0,1\}}} \prod_{T\neq\emptyset}(x_T\varepsilon_T)^{k_T} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n} F^{(k)}(x)\sum_{\emptyset\neq S\subseteq\{1,\ldots,n\}}\sum_{\substack{\text{partition} \\ S_1,\ldots,S_k \text{ of } S}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{S_i}\right)\varepsilon_S \\
&= \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,\ldots,n\}}\left(\sum_{\substack{\text{partition} \\ S_1,\ldots,S_k \text{ of } S}} F^{(k)}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{S_i}\right)\varepsilon_S.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Eq. 2.3, from which the rest of the lemma readily follows. □

Remark 2.7. Let $\mathbb{D}_K^n = K[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]$, where K is $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. The lemma allows one to extend any partial function $F : K \longrightarrow K$ to a partial function $F : \mathbb{D}_K^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{D}_K^n$ defined on the set $\Big\{z \in \mathbb{D}_K^n : F^{(n)}(|z|) \text{ exists}\Big\}$, where $|z|$ denotes the coefficient $x_\emptyset$ of $z = \sum_S x_S\varepsilon_S$.

Example 2.8. For $n = 2$ one has

$$F(x + x_1\varepsilon_1 + x_2\varepsilon_2 + x_{12}\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2) = F(x) + F'(x)x_1\varepsilon_1 + F'(x)x_2\varepsilon_2 + (F''(x)x_1x_2 + F'(x)x_{12})\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2.$$

For $n = 3$ one has that the expression

$$F(x + x_1\varepsilon_1 + x_2\varepsilon_2 + x_3\varepsilon_3 + x_{12}\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 + x_{13}\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_3 + x_{23}\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_3 + x_{123}\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_3)$$

is equal to the sum of $F(x)$, the linear terms $F'(x)x_1\varepsilon_1 + F'(x)x_2\varepsilon_2 + F'(x)x_3\varepsilon_3$, the quadratic terms

$$(F''(x)x_1x_2 + F'(x)x_{12})\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 + (F''(x)x_1x_3 + F'(x)x_{13})\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_3 + (F''(x)x_2x_3 + F'(x)x_{23})\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_3,$$

and the cubic term

$$(F'''(x)x_1x_2x_3 + F''(x)x_{12}x_3 + F''(x)x_{13}x_2 + F''(x)x_{23}x_1 + F'(x)x_{123})\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_3.$$

Remark 2.9. There are a total of $B_{n+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}B_k$ terms in the double sum of Eq. 2.3, while there are a total of $B_{n+2} - B_{n+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{n}{k}\binom{k}{l}B_l$ terms in the triple sum of Eq. 2.4, where B_k denotes the kth Bell number, equal to the number of partitions of a k-element set. Also, there are a total of 2^n terms in the sum of Eq. 2.1 and a total of 3^n terms in the double sum of Eq. 2.2.

Theorem 2.10 (with Ryan Hoffman, Cybill Kreil, and Alexander McBroom)**.** *Let R be a ring. For all positive integers n and all nonnegative integers k one has*

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]) = \bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}} \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R)\varepsilon_S,$$

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]) = \bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}} \mathrm{Int}^{(n+k-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S,$$

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]) = \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}\left(R+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{0,1\}\varepsilon_i,\, R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]\right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}} \mathrm{Int}^{(n-|S|)}(R)\varepsilon_S$. The theorem can be reduced to showing that

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]) = \mathrm{Int}\left(R+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{0,1\}\varepsilon_i,\, R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]\right).$$

Each of these three rings is a subring of the ring $K[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n][X]$, where $K = T(R)$. Let $F = \sum_S f_S\varepsilon_S \in K[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n][X]$. Suppose that $F\in\mathcal{A}$, so that $f_S^{(k)}\in\mathrm{Int}(R)$ for all $S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$ and all k with $|S|+k\le n$. For all $T\subseteq S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$ such that T has a partition into k subsets, one has $|T|\ge k$ and therefore $|S-T|+k = |S|-|T|+k \le n-(|T|-k)\le n$. Therefore $f_{S-T}^{(k)}\in\mathrm{Int}(R)$ for all such S,T,k. It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}}\left(\sum_{T\subseteq S}\sum_{\substack{\text{partition}\\ T_1,\ldots,T_k \text{ of } T}} f_{S-T}^{(k)}(x_\emptyset)\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{T_i}\right)\varepsilon_S \in R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]$$

for all $\mathbf{x} = \sum_S x_S\varepsilon_S \in R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]$, and therefore $F\in\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n])$. Therefore one has

$$\mathcal{A}\subseteq\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n])\subseteq\mathrm{Int}\left(R+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{0,1\}\varepsilon_i,\, R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]\right).$$

It remains only to show, then, that if $F\in\mathrm{Int}\left(R+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{0,1\}\varepsilon_i,\, R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n]\right)$, then $F\in\mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 2.6 one has

$$F(x+x_1\varepsilon_1+x_2\varepsilon_2+\cdots+x_n\varepsilon_n) = \sum_{S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}}\left(\sum_{T\subseteq S} f_{S-T}^{(|S|)}(x)\prod_{i\in T}x_i\right)\varepsilon_S \in R[\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n],$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{T\subseteq S} f_{S-T}^{(|T|)}(x)\prod_{i\in T}x_i \in R \text{ for all } S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\},$$

for all $x\in R$ and all $x_1,\ldots,x_n\in\{0,1\}$. We claim that each of the terms $f_{S-T}^{(|T|)}(x)$ appearing in the above sum (for all $T\subseteq S\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$) must lie in R and therefore $F\in\mathcal{A}$. The proof for fixed S and x is by induction on $|T|$. If $|T|=0$, then $T=\emptyset$. Letting $x_i=0$ for all i, we see that

$$f_S^{(0)}(x) = \sum_{V\subseteq S} f_{S-V}^{(|V|)}(x)\prod_{i\in V}x_i \in R,$$

which proves the base case. Suppose that $f_{S-T}^{(|S|)}(x)\in R$ for subsets T of S of cardinality at most $k-1$. Let T be a subset of S of cardinality k. Let

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i\in T\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Then

$$f_{S-T}^{(|T|)}(x) + \sum_{V\subsetneq T} f_{S-V}^{(|V|)}(x) = \sum_{V\subseteq T} f_{S-V}^{(|V|)}(x) = \sum_{V\subseteq S} f_{S-V}^{(|V|)}(x)\prod_{i\in V}x_i \in R,$$

while by the inductive hypothesis one has $\sum_{V\subsetneq T} f_{S-V}^{(|V|)}(x)\in R$. Therefore $f_{S-T}^{(|T|)}(x)\in R$. □

Remark 2.11. A subset A of a ring R is said to be *polynomially dense in* R if $\mathrm{Int}(A,R) = \mathrm{Int}(R)$. Theorem 2.10 is equivalent to the conjunction of Theorem 1.1 and the fact that the set $R + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \{0,1\}\varepsilon_i$ is polynomially dense in $R[\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n]$.

3. Integer-valued polynomials on generalizations of the hyper-dual numbers

Let R be a ring. Consider the ring $R[j] = R[T]/(T^2 - 1)$, where j is the image of T in the given quotient ring. The ring $\mathbb{R}[j]$ is called the ring of *split complex numbers*, or *hyperbolic numbers*. We call $R[j]$ the ring of *split complex numbers over* R. Note that $R[j] = R[1+j] = R[U]/(U(U-2))$, where j is the image of $U - 1$ in the given quotient ring.

The dual numbers and split complex numbers over R generalize as follows. Let r be a fixed element of R, and let $R[\rho] = R[T]/(T(T-r))$, where ρ is the image of T in the given quotient ring. If $r = 0$, then we obtain the ring of dual numbers $R[\rho] = R[\varepsilon]$, where $\rho = \varepsilon$. If $r = 2$, then we obtain the ring of split complex numbers $R[\rho] = R[j]$, where $\rho = 1 + j$. If r is a unit, then $R[\rho] \cong R \times R$.

For all $z = x + y\rho \in R[\rho]$ we define $\overline{z} = x + y(r - \rho)$ and $||z|| = z\overline{z} = x(x + ry) = x^2 + rxy$. Note that $\overline{\overline{z}} = z$ and $\overline{zw} = \overline{z}\ \overline{w}$, and therefore $||zw|| = ||z||\,||w||$, for all $z, w \in R[\rho]$. The map $Q : R^2 \longrightarrow R$ given by $(x,y) \longmapsto x^2 + rxy$ is a rank two quadratic form over R, and the ring $R[\rho]$ is the even Clifford algebra of Q.

Lemma 3.1. *Let R be a ring and $z \in R[\rho]$. Then $z = x + y\rho$ is a non-zerodivisor (resp., unit) of $R[\rho]$ if and only if $||z||$ is a non-zerodivisor (resp., unit) of R, if and only if x and $x + ry$ are non-zerodivisors (resp., units) of R.*

Lemma 3.2. *Let R be a ring. Then the total quotient ring $T(R[\rho])$ of $R[\rho]$ is given by $T(R)[\rho]$, where $T(R)$ is the total quotient ring of R.*

For all $f \in R[X]$, we may write $f(X+Y) - f(X) = Yg(X,Y)$ for a unique $g \in R[X,Y]$. We write $\Delta_Y f(X) = g(X,Y) \in R[X,Y]$, so that $\Delta_Y f(X)$ denotes $\frac{f(X+Y)-f(X)}{Y}$ but is a polynomial in X and Y. We may then define $\Delta_y f(X) = g(X,y) \in R[X]$, whence Δ_y is an R-linear operator on $R[X]$, for all $y \in R$. One has $\Delta_Y f(X) = f'(X) + YG(X,Y)$ for some $G \in R[X,Y]$, and therefore $\Delta_0 f(X) = f'(X)$. One has the following generalization of the product and chain rules for derivatives:

$$\Delta_Y(f \cdot g)(X) = \Delta_Y f(X) \cdot g(X+Y) + f(X) \cdot \Delta_Y g(X)$$

and

$$\Delta_Y(f \circ g)(X) = (\Delta_{g(X+Y))-g(X)} f)(g(X))\Delta_Y g(X)$$

for all $f, g \in R[X]$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let R be a ring, let $r \in R$, and let $R[\rho] = R[T]/(T(T-r))$, where ρ is the image of T in the given quotient ring. For all $F \in R[\rho][X]$ and all $x, y \in R$, one has*

$$F(x + y\rho) = F(x) + \Delta_{yr}F(x) \cdot y\rho = F(x + yr) + y\Delta_{yr}F(x) \cdot (\rho - r).$$

Proof. As with Lemma 2.3, one can verify the lemma for $F = X^n$ and then extend by linearity. □

For any $r \in R$, we let

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; r) = \{f \in \mathrm{Int}(R) : \forall y \in R\ (y\Delta_{yr} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R))\}.$$

Note, for example, that

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; 0) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; 1) = \mathrm{Int}(R; r) = \mathrm{Int}(R)$$

if r is a unit of R.

Proposition 3.4. *Let R be a ring, let $r \in R$, and let $R[\rho] = R[T]/(T(T-r))$, where ρ is the image of T in the given quotient ring. For all $f, g \in T(R)[X]$, one has $f + g\rho \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho])$ if and only if $f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; r)$ and $g \in \mathrm{Int}(R)$. Equivalently, one has*

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]) = \mathrm{Int}(R; r) + \mathrm{Int}(R)\rho.$$

Proof. Let $F = f + g\rho$. By Lemma 3.3 one has

$$\begin{aligned} F(x + y\rho) &= f(x) + y\Delta_{yr} f(x) \cdot \rho + (g(x) + y\Delta_{yr} g(x) \cdot \rho)\rho \\ &= f(x) + (y\Delta_{yr} f(x) + g(x) + yr\Delta_{yr} g(x))\rho \\ &= f(x) + (y\Delta_{yr} f(x) + g(x + yr))\rho. \end{aligned}$$

If $F \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho])$, then clearly $f, g \in \mathrm{Int}(R)$ (e.g., consider the case $y = 0$), so, subtracting $g(x + yr)\rho \in R[\rho]$ from the equation above we see that $f(x) + y\Delta_{yr} f(x) \cdot \rho \in R[\rho]$ for all $x, y \in R$ and therefore $f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; r)$. Conversely, we see immediately from the same equation that if $f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; r)$ and $g \in \mathrm{Int}(R)$ then $F = f + g\rho \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho])$. □

Corollary 3.5. *Let R be a ring. One has*

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon]) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R) + \mathrm{Int}(R)\varepsilon$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[j]) = \mathrm{Int}(R; 2) + \mathrm{Int}(R)(1 + j).$$

Now, let

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R; r) = \{f \in T(R)[X] : f, f' \in \mathrm{Int}(R; r)\}$$

for any $r \in R$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let R be a ring, let $r \in R$, and let $R[\rho, \varepsilon] = R[T, U]/(T(T-r), U^2)$, where ρ is the image of T and ε is the image of U. One has*

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho, \varepsilon]) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R; r) + \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R)\rho + \mathrm{Int}(R; r)\varepsilon + \mathrm{Int}(R)\rho\varepsilon.$$

Moreover, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R; r) &= T(R)[X] \cap \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho, \varepsilon]), \\ \mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon]; r) &= T(R)[\varepsilon][X] \cap \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho, \varepsilon]) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R; r) + \mathrm{Int}(R; r)\varepsilon, \\ \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R[\rho]) &= T(R)[\rho][X] \cap \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho, \varepsilon]) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R; r) + \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R)\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that $R[\rho, \varepsilon] = R[\rho][\varepsilon] = R[\varepsilon][\rho]$. Therefore one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon, \rho]) &= \mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon]; r) + \mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon])\rho \\ &= \mathrm{Int}(R[\varepsilon]; r) + \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R)\rho + \mathrm{Int}(R)\rho\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho, \varepsilon]) &= \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R[\rho]) + \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho])\varepsilon \\ &= \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R[\rho]) + \mathrm{Int}(R; r)\varepsilon + \mathrm{Int}(R)\rho\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

One checks that the elements of $\mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R; r)$ are precisely the polynomials in $T(R)[X]$ that lie in $\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho, \varepsilon])$. The proposition follows by combining these facts. □

To extend Proposition 3.4 to compute $\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n])$, we need the following definitions. We let

$$\mathrm{Int}(R;\ ) = \mathrm{Int}(R),$$

and for any elements $s_1, \ldots, s_{m+1}$ of R we let

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; s_1, \ldots, s_{m+1})$$

equal the set of all $f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; s_1, \ldots, s_m)$ such that $y\Delta_{ys_{m+1}\prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,m\}-\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\}} s_i} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R; s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k})$ for all $y \in R$ and all $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq m$, which by induction on m is an $R[X]$-subalgebra of $\mathrm{Int}(R)$. For example, $\mathrm{Int}(R; r)$ is as defined earlier, and

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; r, s) = \{f \in \mathrm{Int}(R, r) : y\Delta_{ys} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R; r) \text{ and } y\Delta_{yrs} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R) \text{ for all } y \in R\}.$$

Since $\Delta_z \Delta_y = \Delta_y \Delta_z$ as operators on $T(R)[X]$ for all $y, z \in R$, one has

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; r_1, \ldots, r_m) = \mathrm{Int}(R; r_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, r_{\sigma(m)})$$

for any permutation σ of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$, so we may define

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; S) = \mathrm{Int}(R; s_1, \ldots, s_m)$$

for any finite multisubset $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_m\}$ of R. Thus we have

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; \emptyset) = \mathrm{Int}(R),$$

and for any finite multisubset S of R and any $s \in R$ we have

$$\mathrm{Int}(R; S \cup \{s\}) = \{f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; S) : y\Delta_{ys\prod_{t\in S-T} t} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R; T) \text{ for all } T \subseteq S \text{ and } y \in R\}.$$

The following proposition is a straightforward generalization of Proposition 3.4.

Proposition 3.7. *Let R be a ring, let $r \in R$, let $R[\rho] = R[T]/(T(T - r))$, where ρ is the image of T in the given quotient ring, and let S be a finite multisubset of R. Then*

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; S) = \mathrm{Int}(R; S \cup \{r\}) + \mathrm{Int}(R; S)\rho.$$

Proof. The proof is by strong induction on $|S|$. The base case $|S| = 0$ is Proposition 3.4. Suppose the proposition holds for $|S| \leq m$, and let $s \in R$. Then

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; S \cup \{s\}) = \{F \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; S) : \alpha\Delta_{\alpha s\prod_{t\in S-T} t} F(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; T) \text{ for all } T \subseteq S, \alpha \in R[\rho]\}.$$

Let $F = f + g\rho$ and $\alpha = y + z\rho$, where $f, g \in T(R)[X]$ and $y, z \in R$. Let $T \subseteq S$ and $u = u_T = s\prod_{t\in S-T} t$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha\Delta_{\alpha u} F(X) &= y\Delta_{yu} F(X) + z\Delta_{zru} F(X)\rho \\ &= y\Delta_{yu} f(X) + (y\Delta_{yu} g(X) + z\Delta_{zru} f(X) + zr\Delta_{zru} g(X))\rho.\end{aligned}$$

Now, one has (1) $F \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; S \cup \{s\})$ if and only if one has (2a) $F \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; S)$ and (2b) $\alpha\Delta_{\alpha u} F(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R[\rho]; T)$ for all α, T. By the inductive hypothesis (2a) holds if and only if $f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; S \cup \{r\})$ and $g \in \mathrm{Int}(R; S)$. Moreover, (2b) holds if and only if $y\Delta_{yu} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R; T \cup \{r\})$ and $y\Delta_{yu} g(X), z\Delta_{zru} f(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R; T)$ (hence also $zr\Delta_{zru} g(X) \in \mathrm{Int}(R; T)$ for $y = zr$) for all y, z, T. It follows readily that (1) holds if and only if $f \in \mathrm{Int}(R; S \cup \{s\} \cup \{r\})$ and $g \in \mathrm{Int}(R; S \cup \{s\})$. This completes the proof. □

The following theorem, which is the main result of this paper, generalizes the previous proposition and Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.8. *Let R be a ring, let $r_1, \ldots, r_n \in R$, let*

$$R[\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n] = R[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(T_1(T_1 - r_1), \ldots, T_n(T_n - r_n)),$$

where ρ_i is the image of T_i in the given quotient ring for all i, and let S be a finite multisubset of R. Let $\rho_T = \prod_{i\in T} \rho_i$, and let r_T denote the multisubset $\{r_{i_1}, \ldots, r_{i_k}\}$ of R, for all $T = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subseteq \mathbf{n} = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. One has

$$\mathrm{Int}(R[\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n]; S) = \bigoplus_{T\subseteq\mathbf{n}} \mathrm{Int}(R; S \cup r_{\mathbf{n}-T})\rho_T.$$

In particular, one has

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_n]) = \bigoplus_{T\subseteq \mathbf{n}} \operatorname{Int}(R; r_{\mathbf{n}-T})\rho_T.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. The statement for $n = 1$ is Proposition 3.7. Suppose the statement holds for $n-1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_n]; S) &= \operatorname{Int}(R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_{n-1}][\rho_n]; S)\\
&= \operatorname{Int}(R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_{n-1}]; S\cup\{r_n\}) + \operatorname{Int}(R[\rho_1,\dots,\rho_{n-1}]; S)\rho_n\\
&= \bigoplus_{T\subseteq \mathbf{n-1}} \operatorname{Int}(R; S\cup\{r_n\}\cup r_{\mathbf{n-1}-T})\rho_T + \left(\bigoplus_{T\subseteq \mathbf{n-1}} \operatorname{Int}(R; S\cup r_{\mathbf{n-1}-T})\rho_T\right)\rho_n\\
&= \bigoplus_{n\notin T\subseteq \mathbf{n}} \operatorname{Int}(R; S\cup r_{\mathbf{n}-T})\rho_T + \bigoplus_{n\in T\subseteq \mathbf{n}} \operatorname{Int}(R; S\cup r_{\mathbf{n}-T})\rho_T\\
&= \bigoplus_{T\subseteq \mathbf{n}} \operatorname{Int}(R; S\cup r_{\mathbf{n}-T})\rho_T.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

It is natural to define $\operatorname{Int}(R;S)$ for any multisubset S of R to be the intersection of the subrings $\operatorname{Int}(R;T)$ of $\operatorname{Int}(R)$ for all finite multisubsets T of S. The rings $\operatorname{Int}(R;S)$ have not been studied before, other than for $S\subseteq\{0,0,0,\dots\}$.

We now provide alternative descriptions of $\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho])$ and $\operatorname{Int}(R;r)$ when r is a non-zerodivisor of R. For any ring homomorphism $\varphi : R\longrightarrow S$, we let

$$\operatorname{Int}(R;\varphi) = \{f\in\operatorname{Int}(R) : \forall a,b\in R\ (\varphi(a)=\varphi(b)\Rightarrow\varphi(f(a)=\varphi(f(b))\}.$$

For any ideal I of R, we let

$$\operatorname{Int}(R;I) = \{f\in\operatorname{Int}(R) : \forall a,b\in R\ (a\equiv b\,(\operatorname{mod} I)\Rightarrow f(a)\equiv f(b)\,(\operatorname{mod} I))\}.$$

Both of these rings are $R[X]$-subalgebras of $\operatorname{Int}(R)$. Note that $\operatorname{Int}(R;\varphi) = \operatorname{Int}(R;\ker\varphi)$ and $\operatorname{Int}(R;I) = \operatorname{Int}(R;\pi)$, where $\pi : R\longrightarrow R/I$ is the natural projection. Thus the two definitions are interchangeable. Note also that

$$I\operatorname{Int}(R)\subseteq\operatorname{Int}(R,I)\subseteq\operatorname{Int}(R;I),$$

where $\operatorname{Int}(R,I) = \{f\in\operatorname{Int}(R) : f(R)\subseteq I\}$, and both $I\operatorname{Int}(R)$ and $\operatorname{Int}(R,I)$ are ideals of both of the rings $\operatorname{Int}(R)$ and $\operatorname{Int}(R;I)$. Moreover, if I is invertible, then an easy argument shows that $\operatorname{Int}(R,I) = I\operatorname{Int}(R)$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let R be a ring and r a non-zerodivisor of R. One has*

$$\operatorname{Int}(R;rR) = \operatorname{Int}(R;r),$$
$$\operatorname{Int}(R,rR) = r\operatorname{Int}(R).$$

We let $R\times_A S = \{(r,s)\in R\times S : \varphi(r) = \psi(s)\}$ denote the pullback of a fixed diagram $R\xrightarrow{\varphi} A\xleftarrow{\psi} S$ of ring homomorphisms. We note the following.

Lemma 3.10. *Let R be a ring and $r\in R$. The map*

$$R[\rho]\longrightarrow R\times_{R/rR} R$$

acting by $x+y\rho\longmapsto(x,x+ry)$ is a surjective ring homomorphism with kernel equal to $\operatorname{Ann}_R(r)\rho$. In particular, if r is a non-zerodivisor of R, then the map is an isomorphism with inverse acting by $(x,y)\longmapsto x+\frac{y-x}{r}\rho$.

Proposition 3.11. *Let R be a ring and $r \in R$. The map*

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho]) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Int}(R;r) \times_{\operatorname{Int}(R;r)/r\operatorname{Int}(R)} \operatorname{Int}(R;r)$$

acting by $f + g\rho \longmapsto (f, f + rg)$ is a surjective ring isomorphism with kernel $\operatorname{Ann}_{\operatorname{Int}(R)}(r)\rho$. In particular, if r is a non-zerodivisor of R, then the map is an isomorphism with inverse acting by $(f,g) \longmapsto f + \frac{g-f}{r}\rho$.

Example 3.12. If r is a unit of R, then $R[\rho] \longrightarrow R \times_{R/rR} R = R \times R$ is an isomorphism, one has $\operatorname{Int}(R;rR) = \operatorname{Int}(R;R) = \operatorname{Int}(R)$, and therefore $\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho]) = \operatorname{Int}(R) + \operatorname{Int}(R)\rho = \operatorname{Int}(R)[\rho] \cong \operatorname{Int}(R) \times \operatorname{Int}(R) = \operatorname{Int}(R) \times_{\operatorname{Int}(R)/r\operatorname{Int}(R)} \operatorname{Int}(R)$.

Let I be an ideal of R, and let C be a complete system of representatives in R of the ring R/I. Then the map

$$\Phi : \operatorname{Int}(R;I) \longrightarrow \prod_{c \in C} R/I$$

acting by $f \longmapsto (f(c) \bmod I)_{c \in C}$ has kernel $\operatorname{Int}(R,I)$ and therefore one has an inclusion

$$\operatorname{Int}(R;I)/\operatorname{Int}(R,I) \longrightarrow \prod_{c \in C} R/I.$$

(The inclusion is an isomorphism if R is a Dedekind domain with finite residue fields and I is nonzero.) Let us denote the image of the map Φ by $\operatorname{Int}(R : I)$, so that $\operatorname{Int}(R;I)/\operatorname{Int}(R,I) \cong \operatorname{Int}(R : I)$. For each $\mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R : I)$, let $f_{\mathbf{c}} \in \operatorname{Int}(R;I)$ with $\Phi(f_{\mathbf{c}}) = \mathbf{c}$. Then $\{f_{\mathbf{c}} : \mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R : I)\}$ is a system of representatives in $\operatorname{Int}(R;I)$ of $\operatorname{Int}(R;I)/\operatorname{Int}(R,I)$, and therefore one has

$$\operatorname{Int}(R;I) = \coprod_{\mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R:I)} (f_{\mathbf{c}} + \operatorname{Int}(R,I)) = \{f_{\mathbf{c}} : \mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R : I)\} + \operatorname{Int}(R,I).$$

Therefore, if r is a non-zerodivisor of R, then by Proposition 3.4 one has

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Int}(R[\rho]) &= \operatorname{Int}(R;rR) + \rho \operatorname{Int}(R) \\ &= \{f_{\mathbf{c}} : \mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R : rR)\} + \operatorname{Int}(R,rR) + \rho \operatorname{Int}(R) \\ &= \{f_{\mathbf{c}} : \mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R : rR)\} + (r,\rho) \operatorname{Int}(R), \end{aligned}$$

and by Proposition 3.11 one has an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho]) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Int}(R;rR) \times_{\operatorname{Int}(R:rR)} \operatorname{Int}(R;rR).$$

Note the special case where $\{f_{\mathbf{c}} : \mathbf{c} \in \operatorname{Int}(R : rR)\} \subseteq R[X]$, from which it follows that

$$\operatorname{Int}(R;rR) = R[X] + r \operatorname{Int}(R)$$

and

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\rho]) = R[X] + (r,\rho) \operatorname{Int}(R).$$

Example 3.13. The map

$$\Phi : \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z};2\mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$

acting by $f \longmapsto (f(0), f(1))$ is surjective, and one has

$$\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z};2\mathbb{Z}) = \{0, 1, X, 1 + X\} + 2 \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}[X] + 2 \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}[j]) &= \{0, 1, X, 1 + X\} + (2, 1 + j) \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= \mathbb{Z}[X] + (2, 1 + j) \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.14. Let p be a prime number and $\mathbb{Z}[\rho] = \mathbb{Z}[T]/(T(T-p))$, where ρ is the image of T. The map

$$\Phi : \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; p\mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^p$$

acting by $f \longmapsto (f(0), f(1), \dots, f(p-1))$ is surjective and in fact is bijective when restricted to the set

$$\{a_0 + a_1X + a_2X(X-1) + \cdots + a_{p-1}X(X-1)\cdots(X-p+1) : a_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X].$$

Therefore, since $(k!, p) = 1$ for all $0 \leq k < p$, one has

$$\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; p\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}[X] + p\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{p} \mathbb{Z}\binom{X}{k} \oplus \bigoplus_{k=p+1}^{\infty} p\mathbb{Z}\binom{X}{k}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}[\rho]) = \mathbb{Z}[X] + (p, \rho)\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

Example 3.15. One has $2\binom{X}{4} + \binom{X}{2}, 2\binom{X}{5} + \binom{X}{3} \in \operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; 4\mathbb{Z})$, and therefore

$$\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; 4\mathbb{Z}) \supsetneq \mathbb{Z}[X] + 4\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

It seems reasonable to conjecture that

$$\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; 4\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}X \oplus \bigoplus_{k=2}^{3} \mathbb{Z}2\binom{X}{k} \oplus \bigoplus_{k=4}^{5} \mathbb{Z}\left(2\binom{X}{k} + \binom{X}{k-2}\right) \oplus \bigoplus_{k=6}^{\infty} \mathbb{Z}4\binom{X}{k}.$$

Problem 3.16. Compute $\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; 4)$, or more generally $\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}; n)$ for composite n.

4. Integer-valued polynomials over the idealization of a module

Let R be a ring and M a (left) R-module. One defines the *(Nagata) idealization of M over R* to be the R-algebra $R(+)M$ whose R-module structure is the R-module $R \oplus M$ and whose multiplication is given by

$$(r, m)(s, n) = (rs, rn + sm)$$

for all $(r, m), (s, n) \in R \oplus M$. (It is defined alternatively as the quotient of the symmetric algebra $S(M) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} S^k(M)$ of M over R by the ideal $\bigoplus_{k=2}^{\infty} S^k(M)$.) It is called the "idealization" of M because the R-module M becomes an ideal $0(+)M$ of the idealization $R(+)M$.

Idealization relates to Proposition 2.4 in two ways. First, note that $R[\varepsilon]$ is isomorphic to the idealization $R(+)R$ over R of the free rank one R-module R. Indeed, one can easily see that the map $R(+)R \longrightarrow R[\varepsilon]$ acting by $(a, b) \longmapsto a + b\varepsilon$ is an isomorphism of R-algebras. Second, note that, since $\operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R) \subseteq \operatorname{Int}(R)$, we may consider $\operatorname{Int}(R)$ as an $\operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)$-algebra, hence as an $\operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)$-module, and then we have an $\operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)$-algebra isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)(+)\operatorname{Int}(R) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R) + \operatorname{Int}(R)\varepsilon = \operatorname{Int}(R[\varepsilon])$$

acting by $(f, g) \longmapsto f + g\varepsilon$. Thus, Proposition 2.4 implies the following.

Corollary 4.1. *One has canonical isomorphisms*

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\varepsilon]) \cong \operatorname{Int}(R(+)R) \cong \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)\,(+)\,\operatorname{Int}(R)$$

for any ring R.

This motivates the following problem.

Problem 4.2. Let R be a ring and M an R-module. Describe $\operatorname{Int}^{(k)}(R(+)M)$ for all nonnegative integers k.

Let M be an R-module. An element a of R is said to be a *non-zerodivisor on M* if $am = 0$ implies $m = 0$ for all $m \in M$. Let $T(M)$ denote the localization $U^{-1}M$, where U is the multiplicative subset M^{reg} of R consisting of all non-zerodivisors on M. Note that the canonical R-module homomorphism $M \longrightarrow T(M)$ is an inclusion, so we consider M as an R-submodule of $T(M)$. We let $M[X] = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} X^k M$ denote the set of all polyomials with coefficients in M, that is, expressions of the form $\sum_{k=0}^{n} X^k m_k$ with n a non-negative integer and $m_k \in M$ for all k. Note that the R-module $M[X]$ is naturally an $R[X]$-module under the $R[X]$-scalar multiplication defined by

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{m} f_j X^j\right)\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} X^k m_k\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{m+n} X^i \left(\sum_{j+k=i} f_j m_k\right)$$

for all $f_j \in R$ and $m_k \in M$. Observe that every $h = \sum_{k=0}^{n} X^k m_k \in M[X]$ determines a function $R \longrightarrow M$ acting by $x \longmapsto h(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} x^k m_k$. We let

$$\mathrm{Int}(R, M) = \{h \in T(M)[X] : h(R) \subseteq M\},$$

which we call the *module of integer-valued polynomials on M over R*. We also let

$$\mathrm{Int}_M(R) = \{f \in U^{-1}R[X] : f(R)M \subseteq M\},$$

which we call the *ring of integer-valued polynomials on R over M*. Note that $\mathrm{Int}_M(R)$ is an $R[X]$-subalgebra of $U^{-1}R[X]$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Int}(R, M)$ is a module over the ring $\mathrm{Int}_M(R)$, since $T(M) = U^{-1}M[X]$ is a module over the ring $U^{-1}R[X]$ and if $f \in \mathrm{Int}_M(R)$ and $h \in \mathrm{Int}(R, M)$ then $fh \in \mathrm{Int}(R, M)$. Note also that

$$M[X] \subseteq \mathrm{Int}(R, M) \subseteq T(M)[X]$$

and

$$(R \cdot 1)[X] \subseteq \mathrm{Int}_M(R) \subseteq U^{-1}R[X],$$

where $R \cdot 1$ is the image of R in $U^{-1}R$.

Remark 4.3. If I is an ideal of R, then $M = I$ is also an R-module and the notation $\mathrm{Int}(R, M)$ conflicts with the notation $\mathrm{Int}(R, I)$ introduced in Section 3. We now use the notation in the former sense rather than the latter.

For all $z = (x, m) \in R(+)M$ we write $z = x + m\varepsilon$. Note, however, that there is no element "ε" of $R(+)M$ since there is no "1" in M. If $f \in R[X]$ and $h \in M[X]$, then we write $(f, h) = f + h\varepsilon$ for the polynomial $\sum_{i=0}^{<\infty} X^i(f_i + h_i\varepsilon)$ of $(R(+)M)[X]$. Note that $M[X]$ is an ideal of the $R[X]$-algebra $(R(+)M)[X]$ when identified with $(0(+)M)[X]$. Let k be a nonnegative integer. We define

$$\mathrm{Int}_M^{(k)}(R) = \{f \in (M^{\mathrm{reg}})^{-1}R[X] : f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(k)} \in \mathrm{Int}_M(R)\},$$

which is an $R[X]$-subalgebra of $T(R)[X]$. We also define

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, M) = \{f \in T(M)[X] : f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(k)} \in \mathrm{Int}(R, M)\},$$

which is a module over the ring $\mathrm{Int}_M^{(l)}(R)$ for $l \geq k$.

The following two lemmas and proposition are straightforward to verify.

Lemma 4.4. *Let R be a ring and M an R-module, and let $(x, m) \in R(+)M$. Then (x, m) is a non-zerodivisor of $R(+)M$ if and only if x is a non-zerodivisor on M and $\mathrm{ann}_R(x) \cap \mathrm{ann}_R(m) = (0)$. Moreover, (x, m) is a unit of $R(+)M$ if and only if x is a unit of R.*

Proposition 4.5. *Let R be a ring and M an R-module such that every non-zerodivisor on M is a non-zerodivisor of R. Let $(x, m) \in R(+)M$. Then (x, m) is a non-zerodivisor of $R(+)M$ if and only if x is a non-zerodivisor on M, and (x, m) is a unit of $R(+)M$ if and only if x is a unit of R. Moreover, the total quotient ring $T(R(+)M)$ of $R(+)M$ is given by $U^{-1}R(+)U^{-1}M$, where U is the multiplicative subset of R consisting of all non-zerodivisors on M.*

Lemma 4.6. *Let R be a ring and M an R-module. Every $F \in (R(+)M)[X]$ can be written uniquely in the form $F = f + h\varepsilon$, where $f \in R[X]$ and $h \in M[X]$. Moreover, one has*

$$F(x + m\varepsilon) = f(x) + (f'(x)m + h(x))\varepsilon$$

for all $x \in R$ and all $m \in M$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let R be a ring and M an R-module such that every non-zerodivisor on M is a non-zerodivisor of R, and let k be a nonnegative integer. Then one has*

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, R(+)M) = \mathrm{Int}_M^{(k)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R) + \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, M)\varepsilon$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R(+)M) = \mathrm{Int}_M^{(k+1)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R) + \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, M)\varepsilon,$$

where also

$$\mathrm{Int}_M^{(k)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R) = (M^{\mathrm{reg}})^{-1}R[X] \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}_M^{(k+1)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R) = \{f \in \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R) : f^{(k+1)}(R)M \subseteq M\}.$$

Moreover, one has canonical isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, R(+)M) = (\mathrm{Int}_M^{(k)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R))\,(+)\,\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, M)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R(+)M) \cong (\mathrm{Int}_M^{(k+1)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R))\,(+)\,\mathrm{Int}^{(k)}(R, M).$$

Proof. We prove the theorem for $k = 0$. The proof easily extends to arbitrary k. The total quotient ring of $R(+)M$ is given by $S = U^{-1}R(+)U^{-1}M$, where $U = M^{\mathrm{reg}} \subseteq R^{\mathrm{reg}}$. . We may write any $F \in S[X]$ uniquely in the form $F = f + h\varepsilon$, where $f \in U^{-1}R[X]$ and $h \in U^{-1}M[X]$. The equalities

$$\mathrm{Int}(R, R(+)M) = \mathrm{Int}_M(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}(R) + \mathrm{Int}(R, M)\varepsilon$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}_M(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}(R) = U^{-1}R[X] \cap \mathrm{Int}(R)$$

are then clear from the definitions and the equation $F(x) = f(x) + h(x)\varepsilon$Then

$$F(x + m\varepsilon) = f(x) + (f'(x)m + h(x))\varepsilon \tag{4.1}$$

for all $x \in R$ and all $m \in M$. Suppose $F \in \mathrm{Int}(R(+)M)$. Then $h \in \mathrm{Int}(R, M)$, so $f = f + 0\varepsilon = F - h\varepsilon \in \mathrm{Int}(R(+)M)$. Since $f \in \mathrm{Int}_M(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}(R)$, one also has $f(x + m\varepsilon) = f(x) + f'(x)m\varepsilon \in R(+)M$, and thus $f'(x)m \in M$, for all $x \in R$ and $m \in M$, and therefore $f \in \mathrm{Int}_M^{(1)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}(R)$. Conversely, if $f \in \mathrm{Int}_M^{(1)}(R) \cap \mathrm{Int}(R)$ and $h \in \mathrm{Int}(R, M)$, then from Eq. 4.1 we see that $F = f + h\varepsilon \in \mathrm{Int}(R(+)M)$. □

Consider, for example, the case where $M = R^n$ is free of rank n for some positive integer n. One has

$$R(+)R^n \cong R[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(T_1, \ldots, T_n)^2,$$
$$\mathrm{Int}(R, R^n) \cong \mathrm{Int}(R)^n,$$
$$\mathrm{Int}_{R^n}(R) = \mathrm{Int}(R),$$
$$\mathrm{Int}_{R^n}^{(1)}(R) = \mathrm{Int}^{(1)}(R).$$

We have

$$R[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n] = R[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(T_1, \ldots, T_n)^2,$$

where δ_i is the image of T_i in the given quotient ring for all i. This ring is called the ring of $(n+1)$-*dimensional dual numbers over* R and is free of rank $n + 1$ as an R-module, canonically isomorphic to $R \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^n R\delta_i$. Thus we have the following.

Corollary 4.8. *Let R be a ring and n a positive integer. Then $R[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n] \cong R(+)R^n$, and one has*

$$\operatorname{Int}(R, R[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n]) = \operatorname{Int}(R)[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n]$$

and

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R) + (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n) \operatorname{Int}(R)[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n] \cong \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R) \,(+)\, \operatorname{Int}(R)^n.$$

Equivalently, as R-modules one has

$$\operatorname{Int}(R[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n]) = \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Int}(R)\delta_i.$$

Another example is the case where $M = R/I$ is the quotient of R by an ideal I. Let U denote the set of all non-zerodivisors mod I of R. (Thus, if $I = \mathfrak{p}$ is prime, then $U = R - \mathfrak{p}$.) One has

$$R \,(+)\, R/I \cong R[\varepsilon]/I\varepsilon \cong R[X]/((X^2) + IX),$$

$$\operatorname{Int}(R, R/I) = \operatorname{Int}(R/I),$$

and, if every non-zerodivisor mod I is a non-zerodivisor, then

$$\operatorname{Int}_{R/I}(R) = U^{-1}R[X] \cap \operatorname{Int}(R),$$

$$\operatorname{Int}^{(1)}_{R/I}(R) = U^{-1}(R)[X] \cap \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R).$$

Thus we have the following.

Corollary 4.9. *Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R such that every non-zerodivisor mod I of R is a non-zerodivisor of R (which holds, for example, if I is a proper ideal of R containing all zerodivisors of R). Let $S = R[X]/((X^2) + IX)$, and let U be the set of all non-zerodivisors mod I of R. One has $S \cong R(+)R/I$ and*

$$\operatorname{Int}(S) \cong (U^{-1}R[X] \cap \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)) \,(+)\, \operatorname{Int}(R/I).$$

Corollary 4.10. *Let R be a ring and $\mathfrak{p}$ a prime ideal of R containing all zerodivisors of R. Let $S = R[X]/((X^2) + \mathfrak{p}X)$. One has $S \cong R(+)R/\mathfrak{p}$ and*

$$\operatorname{Int}(S) \cong (R_{\mathfrak{p}}[X] \cap \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(R)) \,(+)\, \operatorname{Int}(R/\mathfrak{p}).$$

Example 4.11. One has $\operatorname{Int}(\mathbb{Z}[T]/(T^2, pT)) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[X] \cap \operatorname{Int}^{(1)}(\mathbb{Z})) \,(+)\, \mathbb{F}_p[X]$ for any prime number p.

Another example is where $M = T(R)$ is the total quotient ring of R.

Corollary 4.12. *Let R be a ring. Let $S = R + T(R)\varepsilon = R + \varepsilon T(R)[\varepsilon] \subseteq T(R)[\varepsilon]$. One has $S \cong R(+)T(R)$ and*

$$\operatorname{Int}(S) = \operatorname{Int}(R) + T(R)[X]\varepsilon = \operatorname{Int}(R) + \varepsilon T(R)[X][\varepsilon] \cong \operatorname{Int}(R) \,(+)\, T(R)[X].$$

A consequence of the above corollary is that $\operatorname{Int}(R + \varepsilon T(R)[\varepsilon])$ has the structure of an $(R + \varepsilon T(R)[\varepsilon])$-plethory if $\operatorname{Int}(R)$ has the structure of an R-plethory [4, Proposition 7.29].

The ordered monoid of regular fractional ideals of R is isomorphic to the ordered monoid of regular fractional ideals of $R + \varepsilon T(R)[\varepsilon]$. It follows that the ring R is Dedekind (resp., Krull, Prüfer, PVMR) if and only if $R + \varepsilon T(R)[\varepsilon]$ is Dedekind (resp., Krull, Prüfer, PVMR), all four of these notions being defined naturally for rings with zerodivisors [8]. (For example, a ring R is said to be *Dedekind* if every regular ideal of R is invertible.) In particular, if D is a Krull domain, then $\operatorname{Int}(D)$ is a PVMD [10], and therefore $\operatorname{Int}(D + \varepsilon T(D)[\varepsilon])$ is a PVMR. Likewise, if D is a Dedekind domain with all residue fields finite, then $\operatorname{Int}(D)$ is a Prüfer domain, and therefore $\operatorname{Int}(D + \varepsilon T(D)[\varepsilon])$ is a Prüfer ring.

Conjecture 4.13. *If R is a Krull ring, then $\operatorname{Int}(R)$ is a PVMR and has the structure of an R-plethory.*

5. Polynomial torsion

Let R be a ring. An R-module M is said to be *without polynomial torsion* if $f(R) = (0)$ implies $f = 0$ for all $f \in M[X]$ [3]. Clearly every R-module without polynomial torsion is R-torsion-free.

Observe that there is a canonical R-module homomorphism $\text{eval} : M[X] \longrightarrow M^R$, where M^R is the R-module of all functions from R to M, or, equivalently, M^R is the direct product $\prod_{r\in R} M$. The image of eval is the $R[X]$-module $P(R, M)$ of all *polynomial functions from R to M*. The kernel of eval is the $R[X]$-submodule $I_M = \{f \in M[X] : f(R) = (0)\}$ of all polynomials in $M[X]$ vanishing on R. Thus one has $P(R, M) \cong M[X]/I_M$ as $R[X]$-modules. Moreover, the R-module M is without polynomial torsion if and only if $I_M = (0)$, if and only if the (surjective) $R[X]$-module homomorphism $\text{eval} : M[X] \longrightarrow P(R, M)$ is an isomorphism.

Note that if $S = M$ is an R-algebra, then $P(R, S)$ is an $R[X]$-algebra, I_S is an ideal of the $R[X]$-algebra $S[X]$, and the isomorphism $P(R, S) \cong S[X]/I_S$ is an isomorphism of $R[X]$-algebras.

Example 5.1 ([9, Lemma 1.1])**.** Let D be an integral domain.

(1) D is without polynomial torsion if and only if D is not a finite field.
(2) If $D = \mathbb{F}_q$ is a finite field, then $I_D = (X^q - X)$.

Example 5.2 ([7, Corollary 5])**.** If R is a finite ring, then I_R is principal if and only if R is reduced, if and only if R is a finite direct product of finite fields.

Example 5.3 ([9, Chapter II Exercise 3])**.** Let R be a ring.

(1) An R-submodule of an R-module without polynomial torsion is without polynomial torsion.
(2) The direct sum and direct product of R-modules without polynomial torsion is without polynomial torsion.
(3) If M is an R-module and N is an R-submodule of M such that both N and M/N are without polynomial torsion, then M is without polynomial torsion.

Proposition 5.4. *Let R be a ring and M an R-module. Then $\text{Int}(R, M) = M[X]$ if and only if the R-module $T(M)/M$ is without polynomial torsion.*

Proof. Let $f \in T(M)[X]$, and let $\overline{f}$ denote the image of f in $(T(M)/M)[X]$. Note that $f \in M[X]$ if and only if $\overline{f} = \overline{0}$ in $(T(M)/M)[X]$, while $f \in \text{Int}(R, M)$ if and only if $\overline{f}(R) = (0)$ in $T(M)/M$. The proposition follows. □

Corollary 5.5. *Let R be a ring. Then $\text{Int}(R) = R[X]$ if and only if the R-module $T(R)/R$ is without polynomial torsion.*

Let R be a ring and M an R-module. An *associated prime* of M is a prime ideal of R of the form $\text{ann}_R(m)$ for some $m \in M$, where $\text{ann}_R(m) = (0 :_R m) = \{r \in R : rm = 0\}$ is the *annihilator of m*.

If $x = m/u \in T(M)$, where $m \in M$ and $u \in M^{\text{reg}}$, and if $\overline{x}$ is the image of x in $T(M)/M$, then $\text{ann}_R(\overline{x}) = (M :_R m/u) = (uM :_R m) = \{r \in R : rm \in uM\}$. An ideal of R of the form $(uM :_R m)$ for $m \in M$ and $u \in M^{\text{reg}}$ is a *conductor ideal of R in M*. In particular, the associated primes of $T(M)/M$ are the prime conductor ideals of R in M.

Proposition 5.6 ([3, Corollaire 1])**.** *Let R be a Noetherian ring and M an R-module. Then M is without polynomial torsion if and only if $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is finite for every associated prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of M.*

Corollary 5.7. *Let R be a Noetherian ring and M an R-module. Then $\text{Int}(R, M) = M[X]$ if and only if $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is finite for every associated prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of the R-module $T(M)/M$, if and only if $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is finite for every prime conductor ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R in M.*

References

[1] J. Borger and B. Wieland, Plethystic algebra, Adv. Math. 194 (2005) 246–283.
[2] P.-J. Cahen and J.-L. Chabert, *Integer-Valued Polynomials*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 48, American Mathematical Society, 1997.
[3] P.-J. Cahen and J.-L. Chabert, Coefficients et valeurs d'un polynôme, Bull. Sci. Math. 95 (1971) 295–304.
[4] J. Elliott, Idempotent plethories, J. Algebra 463 (2016) 33–79.
[5] J. Elliott, Some new approaches to integer-valued polynomial rings, in: *Commutative Algebra and its Applications: Proceedings of the Fifth International Fez Conference on Commutative Algebra and Applications*, Eds. M. Fontana, S. Kabbaj, B. Olberding, and I. Swanson, de Gruyter, New York, 2009.
[6] J. Elliott, Universal properties of integer-valued polynomial rings, J. Algebra 318 (2007) 68–92.
[7] R. Gilmer, The ideal of polynomials vanishing on a commutative ring, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 127 (5) (1999) 1265–1267.
[8] J. A. Huckaba and I. J. Papick, Quotient rings of polynomial rings, Manuscripta Math. 31 (1–3) (1980) 167–196.
[9] W. Narkiewicz, *Polynomial Mappings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1600, Springer, 1995.
[10] F. Tartarone, Integer-valued polynomials and Prüfer v-multiplication domains, J. Algebra 226 (2) (2000) 765–787.

Department of Mathematics, California State University, Channel Islands, Camarillo, California 93012

E-mail address: jesse.elliott@csuci.edu